

IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
FOR THE DISTRICT OF MARYLAND

WILLIAM C. BOND

*

Plaintiff

*

vs.

*

CIVIL ACTION NO. MJG-01-2600

KENNETH BLUM, SR., et al.

*

Defendants

*

* * * * *

MEMORANDUM AND ORDER

The Court has before it Plaintiff's Limited Motion to Alter or Amend Memorandum And Order of July 12, 2007 [Document 277]. The Court finds that neither a response nor a hearing is necessary.

Plaintiff contends that, due to an error by the office of the Clerk of Court, he was deprived of the opportunity to have the Court consider his Supplement to Motion to Reconsider Memorandum And Order [Document 273] [the "Supplement"] before issuing its July 12, 1977 Memorandum And Order [Document 277]. The Court, assuming that there was an error as alleged by Plaintiff, has considered the contents of the Supplement. The Supplement, if available prior to issuance of the Memorandum And Order Re: Recusal Reconsideration [Document 267] and prior to the Memorandum And Order issued July 12, 2007 [Document 277], would have made no difference whatsoever in this Court's action.

While no discussion is necessary, it is appropriate to note that even if there were some basis for contending that the undersigned Judge should recuse himself in a case in which Mr. Sandler is counsel,¹ the matter would be of no moment in the instant case. Plaintiff appears to contend that the fact that in 2004 Plaintiff sued Miriam Pessin (not a party in the instant case) and Paul Mark Sandler, Esquire (not counsel in the instant case) became counsel for Miriam Pessin in that 2004 case, somehow had some pertinence to this case. However, in the instant case, well before Plaintiff sued Ms. Pessin and Mr. Sandler became her counsel, this Court had entered judgment for the Defendants (November 27, 2001), there was the January 24, 2003 affirmance by the United States Court of Appeals for the Fourth Circuit and this Court awarded legal fees to law firm Defendants pursuant to the Fourth Circuit remand on April 25, 2003 and May 6, 2003.

Finally, as stated in this Court's Memorandum And Order issued July 12, 2007, "there is no doubt whatsoever that any reasonable judge would, as did the unanimous panel of the United States Court of Appeals for the Fourth Circuit, rule that

¹ There is no such basis and, indeed, Mr. Sandler has been, and is currently, counsel in various cases before the undersigned Judge without any issue having been raised by anyone.

Plaintiff's claims presented in the instant case were without merit." [Document 274] at 7.

Accordingly, Plaintiff's Limited Motion to Alter or Amend Memorandum And Order of July 12, 2007 [Document 277] is DENIED.

SO ORDERED, on Thursday, July 26, 2007.

_____/ s /_____
Marvin J. Garbis
United States District Judge